

R E M A R K S

Claims 11-30 are in the case. The amendments to the Claims are discussed below.

The withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of the previous Office Action is noted with sincere appreciation.

Rejection under §112, first paragraph

Claims 11-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement, for containing subject matter not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 11, 16, and 21 are rejected because the phrase "maintained at about 13.0 or greater" appears to be new matter. Claims 11, 16, and 21, as well as Claim 26, have been amended to recite "in the range of about 13.0 to about 14.0", as the Examiner has suggested. Support for these amendments is found in the Specification at least at Page 12, lines 7-9.

Claims 12, 14, 17, 19, 24, and 29 are rejected because the phrase "the molar ratio of sulfamic acid to bromine chloride" appears to be new matter. Claims 12, 14, 17, 19, 24, and 29, as well as Claims 22 and 27, have been amended to recite "an atom ratio of nitrogen to active bromine", as the Examiner has suggested. Support for these amendments is found in the Specification at least in the Abstract and at Page 10, lines 4-9, and lines 19-25.

Claims 22-30 are rejected because the phrase "sulfamate stabilized halogen" appears to be new matter. In Claims 22-30, as well as Claim 21, the amendment deletes "sulfamate", "halogen", and "solution" and inserts "formulation", so that this portion of these claims reads as "stabilized aqueous biocidal formulation". Support for these amendments is found in the Specification at least Page 12, lines 17-18.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in light of the above amendments and remarks.

Suggestions for the Claims

The Examiner has made several suggestions regarding further amendments to the claims to improve their phrasing, which suggestions are appreciated. Many of the suggested amendments have been made. In particular:

Claims 11, 16, 21, and 26 have been amended to insert "said" after "during".

Claims 13, 15, 18, and 20:

the term "resultant" has been deleted and the word "produced" has been added after "composition";

the phrase "to the solution" has been inserted after the word "added"; and

the phrase "amount of said" has been inserted before "bromine chloride", so that this portion of these claims reads as "a sufficient amount of said bromine chloride".

Claims 16 and 26 have been amended to recite "feeding additional" base, to make clear that the base referred to in this part of these claims is additional to the base used in forming the alkali metal sulfamate solution. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification at least at Page 9, line 24, to Page 10, line 1.

Claims 12, 14, 17, and 19 have been amended to recite that the nitrogen to active bromine ratio is "from the bromine chloride and alkali metal sulfamate solution". This amendment finds support in the Specification at least at Page 10, lines 4-9, where the proportions of the components being fed are in the desired ratio.

Acknowledgement of submitted IDSes

Applicants have not received acknowledgement that the Examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on May 9, 2003. It is hereby requested that the Examiner forward such acknowledgement to Applicants at his earliest convenience.

Request for Corrected Publication

The undersigned exchanged voicemails with the Examiner because it has come to Applicants' attention that Page 4 of the Specification was omitted from the U.S. publication of this application. Page 4 of the Specification appears on Public PAIR. The Legal

Department at the USPTO advised the undersigned that to insure that any patent that issues from this application is printed correctly, a transmittal entitled "Request for Corrected Publication" should be filed, even though republication is not being requested. Thus, for the Examiner's information, we mention that such Request for Corrected Publication is being concurrently filed with this Response.

In light of the foregoing remarks, the case is believed to be in condition for allowance. Prompt notification to this effect would be sincerely appreciated.

If any matters remain that require further consideration, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the number given below so that such matters may be discussed, and if possible, promptly resolved.

Please continue to address all correspondence in this Application to Albemarle Corporation, at the address of record.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mary H. Drabnis/

Mary H. Drabnis
Reg. No. 45,909
McGlinchey Stafford, PLLC
Attn: IP Group
301 Main Street, 14th Floor
Baton Rouge, LA 70802
Telephone: 225-382-3718
Facsimile: 225-343-3076